

BW404

W4P7

Gundore
Mysore

Conference Deputation at Touch

1057

108

BW404
WAP7

Wesley Memorial Library

**Thursfield Smith Collection
of
Wesleyana**



Atlanta, - Georgia

Wes. 1569

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

CONFERENCE DEPUTATION AT LOUTH.

During the sittings of the last Wesleyan Conference, the state of the Louth Circuit was brought prominently forward, and a deputation was appointed to visit its rebellious people. On Friday, the 19th of September, this deputation arrived, consisting of Drs. Hannah (the President) and Beecham, Mr. Isaac Keeling, and the chairman of the district, Mr. Bacon. Two days previously, printed invitations, signed by Mr. Loutit, the superintendent, were sent to the office-bearers of the circuit. After the Conference the Louth friends were kept in suspense as to who were really coming, when they would come, and as to what would be the object of their mission. Questions on these subjects were again and again proposed to the preachers who had been to Conference, but they professed to be entirely in the dark respecting them. However, Friday morning came, and with it the above deputation. Although the morning was wet, gloomy, and cold, between sixty and seventy office-bearers, from town and country, got together to meet them. The three preachers newly appointed to labour in the circuit were present. Ten o'clock was the hour appointed for the deputation appearing in the vestry, but they were not very punctual, it being considerably after that time when they appeared. When they arrived the President gave out a hymn, Mr. Keeling read a chapter, and Mr. Bacon engaged in prayer. After which, Dr. HANNAH opened the business of the meeting by alluding to himself as being a native of the county. He remembered hearing a remark once made by the eminent Richard Watson (himself a native of Lincolnshire), that "nowhere did he find more lovely and flourishing societies than there!" He (the Doctor) could not forget a delightful District Meeting he was once privileged to attend, when he spent a short time with his friends in the neighbourhood, when they had "seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," and that morning, while his friend was engaging in prayer, he thought within himself "the old feeling is not gone!" "I begin this meeting," he said, "by saying I have confidence in you. I hope you will have confidence in me. Let us resolve to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, truth in charity, and charity in truth,—and wait to know the will of our Heavenly Master. Perhaps it may be well not to take up the time by referring to the memorial you forwarded to Conference, as a large and influential committee has been appointed to take it, and others, into serious consideration. That committee, I may now state, will, ere long, commence its deliberations, when a portion of time, say a week, or even two or three, can be spent in calmly deliberating upon the present important questions. When it meets our lay friends can offer their advice and suggestions. You had better, therefore, wait until that time! Another idea occurs to me, that it will be better not to occupy time by entertaining individual cases of discipline. This would be doing work not properly belonging to us. The ordinary courts are sufficient for such affairs. Upon the whole, I think it will be best to ask you what we are now to do? We want no formal resolutions. If we can only succeed in some measure in promoting peace and unity, well and good. *I would rather no notes were taken for publication,* as that might prevent a free and unreserved interchange of idea. I hope nothing extraneous will be introduced, and I shall now desire our Louth friends to tell us all that is in their hearts, kindly, affectionately, confidently; and may the blessing of the God of peace be upon all those who seek peace, and may they eventually shine as the sun in the firmament!"

After a few moments silence, the chairman called upon Mr. SHARPLEY, who rather hesitatingly obeyed the summons, and commenced by saying, "I confess, Mr. President, I feel at a loss to know why you and your reverend brethren have come hither. What is the object of the deputation in now appearing amongst us? I have asked our superintendent, but cannot learn from him."

Mr. LOUTIT: I told you it was intended to have a free conversation, and nothing more.

Mr. SHARPLEY: If one part of your object has any reference to the proceedings, which are reported to have taken place in the circuit during the past eighteen months, I can only say, there has been much of truth stated, and much of falsehood or exaggeration! I deeply regret that such misrepresentation has been made. As to what has taken place in our official meetings, we believe, upon the whole, we have conducted ourselves both respectfully and kindly to our late ministers; in fact, I have their own statements to prove that we have not placed ourselves in an offensive position with reference to them. When I looked upon my old friend Mr. Keeling (I hope he will allow me to call him my old friend) pleasing recollections were revived in my mind. When he was located with us in this circuit, we had no shyness or bickering; all was open, and friendly, and cheerful, from January to December: our Leaders' Meetings in those days were "means of grace!" The object of both ministers and people was one—the promotion of God's glory in the salvation of the souls of men; and, happily, our efforts were not unaccompanied with success! Thus we went on, from year to year, in the exercise of administrative power, without let or hindrance, or any objection from our ministers. Perhaps our usages were not such as prevailed in other circuits, but we then knew nothing of that. The thing worked well, and all went on quietly and harmoniously until 1840. Then, unhappily, there took place that which resulted in heart-burnings and distrust! Measures and practices were forced upon us such as we had not been accustomed to; and although the Louth Leaders' Meeting submitted to those practices, it never acquiesced in them! Though we could not be forgetful of this conduct persisted in by the preachers, we still united with them in carrying on the good work. It was not until certain individuals (whom I need not now particularly name), who felt aggrieved, came here to state their real or imaginary grievances, thus eventually leading to the exercise of discipline, that the usages of other places were introduced here; and those interfered with the unanimity of our meetings. Many of my friends entertain similar ideas to my own on this subject. The President wishes no reference may be made to our memorial, nor to particular cases of discipline; it will be a difficult matter to avoid it. The opinions of certain parties are decidedly opposed to those of my own and of many of my friends. If I sit under a ministry and receive the truths of the Gospel, I feel bound to support it. If I considered the preachers Jesuitical and designing men, I would withdraw from them. In thus speaking, I believe, I am not giving expression to my own individual sentiments, but to those of a large proportion of the leaders and principal friends. I regret that we have suffered so much in our finances, and that we are, consequently, compelled to have a reduced number of ministers. Whatever representations may have been made, in a certain quarter, opposite to what I have now stated, they are false! It is untrue that we are disposed for strife, contention, and disorganisation. We ought to agree to differ. We cannot afford, in these times, to do otherwise; nevertheless, we cannot afford to surrender some of those customs and usages which are coeval with the circuit itself, and which have always been promotive of its advantages! I should like to have unanimity, if possible; but I do not see how this can be accomplished, if we are required to give up that which we believe ourselves by right entitled to. I refer to one instance: We have an impression that a leader does not discharge the duties of his office if he himself refuses to contribute; for, although he may not, in so many words, say to his members, "Don't pay," yet, practically, he does so. Well, we had a leader who "stopped supplies;" he was required by the superintendent to appear before a Leaders' Meeting to be tried; but how? Why, as a member! We at once said, we cannot do this. There is a difference between trying a man as a member and as a leader. If this leader is tried as a mere member, then, according to the present law of Methodism, if the leaders gave a verdict against the man, his leadership would avail him nothing—he would be at the mercy of the superintendent. I have no doubt but that much of the mischief that has arisen is the result of our late superintendent having a want of confidence in the Leaders' Meeting. Why, it has been said, that we were laying our heads together to concoct a scheme to divide the society, to carry away as many as we could, and form ourselves into a separate and independent church! We have acted in good faith, and had no intention whatever of acting

otherwise. Then, again, another cause of difference arose. A case of discipline was brought before the leaders ; the superintendent, as we thought, unhappily introduced all his colleagues to the Leaders' Meeting. We thought he was acting in contravention of our usages and of the laws of the Connexion. We consulted the constitution of a Leaders' Meeting, and found that our usage was in accordance with it. We then saw that if such a thing was to obtain, our preachers would not only be present when cases of discipline were introduced, but would also vote. In this case fifty village societies might be outnumbered by the presence of the ministers. Had the superintendent proceeded according to what we consider to be the proper definition of the law, we could have acted with him ; but, now, we have a brother left without his ticket still meeting with, and recognised by, his leader. This man was refused a trial by the superintendent because of this disputed point, and, of course, until his guilt (which he denies) is proved, we will acknowledge him as a member. I know not how our differences are to be accommodated. Those differences have had their origin in the vagueness and ambiguity of our laws. I have some old papers in my possession which belonged to my grandfather. These state, that, in the beginning, the leaders acted concurrently with the preachers. Mr. Sharpley then appealed to Mr. Keeling as to what he recollects of these matters when in the Louth Circuit.

Mr. KEELING : I don't remember that a case of discipline occurred while I was superintendent here, which was only one year ; and I may add that questions on jurisprudence do not generally arise until some particular case occurs to bring them out. I think it is probable that the usage of only one preacher being present at a trial, may have originated from the circumstance of only one preacher being generally at home. When I was here, it was next to impossible for more than one minister to be present on such occasions, as his colleagues would have appointments in the country. And then, with respect to leaders being tried as leaders, I may say that, for forty years, I have never known a leader to be tried otherwise than as a member. Certain peculiar instances were then adduced by Mr. Keeling, by which he endeavoured to make good his assertions.

Mr. SHARPLEY replied, proving that, in those particular instances adduced, the Leaders' Meeting acted concurrently with the ministers in declaring certain members unfit to continue members of society if they persisted in certain practices. Mr. Sharpley then urged these cases as illustrations of the difficulties they had to contend with ; and observed, that in these times of excitement, and of agencies calculated to mystify and mislead, both preachers and leaders ought to exercise great forbearance. "Mr. Loutit knows well, and it is well known elsewhere, that we have many meeting in class with us who are not paying what they can afford. Many of these are men whom we respect,—men of long standing and great usefulness in the Church ; in dealing with them, great caution is needful. Now, as to stopping supplies, I hate coercion myself, and think that ministers ought not to be coerced ! If they submitted to coercion, I should think them unworthy. I wish to make this impression on the minds of the President and his Reverend Brethren, that, bad as we have been represented to be, we are not so very bad after all ! In spite of all the opprobrium which has been cast upon us, we are not altogether bad ! I have my conviction, that a certain party whom I could name has, in his endeavour to carry out plans, failed in judgment, and has then thrown the blame upon us ! Well, here we are ; and, I confess, I don't know how we are to get out of our difficulties. When Dr. Warren visited us in 1835, he could make no impression. We said, 'What do you want ? We have all we require.' Then we acted with the minister who might be present. How we are to part with this, and retain our rights, I cannot tell. If four ministers are allowed to be present during disciplinary proceedings, then they can overwhelm every society in the circuit except Louth. If Mr. Loutit should have a case of discipline to bring before us, I don't know how we should proceed. We think we cannot give up this point ! If our town and country leaders could receive the impression, the conviction, that it is their duty to pay, and to urge their members also to pay towards the circuit funds, a great deal would be secured. There would then be no trial for that cause, and the thing would be allowed to remain in abeyance until next Conference. I hail the presence of yourself in this important circuit, not as President only, but as a minister ; but you must act towards us with great kindness and forbearance, and matters must not be pushed to an issue with undue haste and severity ! I hope Mr. Loutit will be exceedingly careful. I trust we shall have no division. In a small town like this, and with a society of nearly 1,000 members, this would be most disastrous."

Dr. BEECHAM regretted that he did not arrive in Louth until six o'clock that morning, and, therefore, had had no previous opportunity of conversing with or consulting

his friends. He was glad to hear the opening remarks of the President, and was also much gratified with Mr. Sharpley's admirable speech, and also by the kindness with which the meeting had received the deputation. It had been represented at Conference that the Louth Society was in a state of great dissatisfaction, and that the late superintendent had great difficulty in carrying on the administration of affairs. The Conference, therefore, felt anxious to know what were the usages which had prevailed in the circuit, and what were the obstructions, if obstructions there were, to the due administration of discipline. For this purpose, they were appointed as a deputation to wait upon them.

Mr. BACON alluded to other usages which he understood had obtained there; and said, in case the Leaders' Meeting and the superintendent were opposed to each other in opinion, as to the law of a case, the former deemed his judgment equal to that of the latter, and acted in accordance with it. "I think," said he, "they ought, if dissatisfied with his definition, to appeal to the Chairman of the District as to the right construction."

Mr. SHARPLEY said he thought he knew what was the particular case to which Mr. Bacon had reference; and, in reference to that particular case, he thought that both parties were alike blameable.

Dr. BEECHAM said he could not imagine that that was really an usage; as, in every properly-constituted meeting, the chairman is considered to have the right to state what is law.

Mr. BACON: I have travelled as a minister thirty-nine years, and, during the whole of that period, I have never heard the right questioned of the preachers to be all present if they chose at a Leaders' Meeting.

Mr. KEELING: I think I know the origin of all this. I can trace it to a resolution of the Conference of 1840. I believe there were a few circuits in which the practices of the Louth Circuit prevailed.

Mr. LARDER, on being called upon, mentioned several circuits in the Connexion where members were received into society through the Leaders' Meeting, and said, "for what we did we had the sanction of the successive superintendents for a long series of years. We had their approbation and concurrence. They took no objection to our practices. They did not dissent from them! Nay, they used to inquire of us, 'Brethren, have you any members to propose?' I take this opportunity to say we are not carried away by new things. We like the old ways. We are reasonable men, and have no great liking for novelties! In our Leaders' Meetings we have, or think we ought to have, all those rights and privileges which were granted in 1797. We believe ourselves entitled to use conjunctive efforts with the ministers. I was glad to learn that Mr. Keeling, in the Manchester and Bolton District Meeting, so excellently and historically treated on these matters. I think I shall not be set down as a blunderer if I express my belief, that, to the elastic system then prevailing, we owe it that the cause of God so flourished amongst us. I am afraid that in 1835 there was a little unnecessary fencing. I don't charge the preachers with positive design, but unnecessary fencing. When I heard what was done at the Conference I felt afraid. It penetrated to my very heart. I thought they were wrong. In those days we did all we could to make our preachers comfortable and to keep up their stipend, and we think we succeeded. I remember when Dr. Warren came here, that I took part in the special prayer-meeting in the Sunday-school. I gave out the hymn commencing—

'Glory to God, whose sovereign grace,' &c.

Well, we went on exceedingly well until 1840, when, somehow or other, we got elbowed and interfered with in our Leaders' Meetings. For nearly a year we were greatly agitated. Before that year it was no unusual thing for us to have five or six members at a time introduced into our society through the Leaders' Meeting; and frequently we have sang, 'Praise God, from whom all blessings flow,' &c., over their admission. In those days our Leaders' Meetings were the heart and soul of our societies, and the preachers have again and again retired from them with their hearts gladdened and refreshed! But, in an evil day, we were interfered with. That close, united confidence in each other, was disturbed; *we felt that we had got something upon our necks!* I am the same person, we are the same men, but I do most seriously and religiously believe, in my own mind, that high ecclesiastical, sacerdotal powers and practices will never take well in Methodism. They may do in the Church of England, where there are laws to compel and State revenues to fall back upon; but they will never do in our simple economy. According to Mr. Keeling's speech, we ought to go back again to 1797, when we should again get into smooth water. I believe from my heart, as an officer of forty years' standing (and write me down a miscalculating man if I am mistaken), we shall never have permanent peace until we do so return.

When our rights were infringed in 1835, I said this fencing about will never do ; it will some day be productive of an outburst ; it will, at no very distant period, cause an estrangement of heart and a loss of confidence. I thank you, Mr. President, for this hearing. I feel this an important matter ! Our system was an elastic one ; it was just the thing for carrying on the work of God ; and, I hope, I shall not be offensive to my beloved ministers when I say that it propped them up ! I should like it to be said to our ministers, and to our people now assembled, 'I never knew an ungracious attack upon our ministers !' I remember the time when, in this town, they used to live in cottages and mean abodes ; and, when I became a member, I was grieved to see them in such humble habitations, and when I became a steward I did my best to better their condition. I am a mischievous man ! I should like to conserve Methodism. In 1797 there was an immense amount of prejudice amongst Methodists against their preachers. I mention this to show that the Methodism of '97 could roll away all this prejudice, and again become beloved and useful. I pray that she may continue to be so, and that we may speedily again glide into 'smooth and gentle waters'—that we may soon weather these storms and tempests, and become what we were aforetime—a united people !'

Dr. BEECHAM wished to know of the leaders present what was the particular usage alluded to ? Whether it was the mere accidental reading of a list of members to be proposed, or of a list given in to be accepted or rejected, by the Leaders' Meeting ? If it be the latter, he must at once say, that *it would involve a principle they could never admit.* "Our friend is mistaken in his allusions to the fencing of 1835, and also to the laws of '97, which were certainly never intended to give into the hands of the leaders a part of that the whole of which God himself has committed to his own ministers, and to none else. Our friend has done us the justice to say, he believes we are influenced by conscientious views and motives ; but we must ever learn to keep up a distinction between Scriptural rights and checks, and counter-checks."

Mr. LARDER : I can only recollect one or two such written lists as are mentioned. We have not been such casuists as to believe we were tying our preachers' hands ! We believe that if the leaders pronounce a man unfit to become a member of society, he ought not to be admitted. Why, it was our custom to publish publicly from the pulpit the names of members proposed, lest we should be imposed upon. I do not sit in this vestry as a leader for nothing. I deem myself to be in some measure responsible for the character of the parties received into the society. But, during the last eleven years, I have known several persons admitted on the recommendation of a single leader, who would not have been received had they been brought before twenty or thirty leaders. We do not, by any means, consider we are encroaching, when, one being allowed to recommend, or otherwise, we ask that twenty or thirty should assent, or be allowed to dissent.

Mr. SHARPLEY : This is our usage. Before a preacher gives a ticket to a member on trial, that member on trial is proposed at a Leaders' Meeting : that Leaders' Meeting exercises its veto ; the Leaders' Meeting does not actually receive the person into society. If our veto is given, the preacher does not admit ; if we do not object, the party is received. It used to be our practice that members, when proposed, were named publicly before a society meeting, and this was repeated when they were accepted. This was discontinued many years ago, as it was thought more seemly to read their names before a Leaders' Meeting. It does seem to me an anomaly for a leader, in his individual capacity, to have power to recommend a member ; and for the leaders, in their united capacity, not to be allowed to know who are admitted. I cannot understand that minute which gives to the leaders concurrent power with the minister, when they are debarred the opportunity of knowing who are to be admitted. Now, when I hear that this principle is not alike applicable to England and Ireland, it perplexes me. I cannot understand how it is that one custom should be law there, and be forbidden here, and I should be obliged by an answer from the President.

No answer was attempted, and Mr. Loutit commenced a severe tirade against the conduct of certain former Leaders' Meetings in the Louth Circuit, and denounced, in strong terms, what he called the indiscretion and rashness of certain leaders,—of one more especially, who had opened a drawer in the very table at which he sat, taken out a note, and demanded of him at once to fill it up with the name of an individual, of the propriety of admitting whom to the society he had serious doubts. "Had I done so," he said, "I should have been merely the secretary of the meeting ! No, you had not a veto only, but also claimed the power to admit members !"

Mr. SHARPLEY explained, by stating that Mr. Loutit had charged the Leaders' Meeting with that which was the act of an individual ; and said, "I maintain, if that rule referring to the leaders' concurrence means anything at all, it certainly means

that the party proposed for admission must be named before a Leaders' Meeting. Your confining that right to the leader, with whom the person intends to meet, gives him a power which you deny to the leaders in their united capacity. We say we have a right to exercise a veto in the fair sense of the word; and the being denied this right has caused much of this dissatisfaction and trouble."

Mr. LARDER asserted his belief that this rule was framed by the Conference of '97, as a midway plan, to endeavour to satisfy those who preferred the reading a list of candidates for admission into society before a society meeting, and those who had rather have had them admitted by the minister exclusively.

Dr. BEECHAM: All this shows the tendency of such usages and practices to render the minister a mere chairman! I can see a wide difference between a member, having met on trial two or three months, being recommended by his leader, and the converse,—a whole Leaders' Meeting considering the question, and saying such and such a person shall be admitted, and such an one rejected.

Mr. KEELING: Conference has never yet taken away the right of any Leaders' Meeting to announce any candidate ineligible for acceptance; their right is not taken away!

Mr. SHARPLEY: The opportunity is!

Mr. KEELING: Perhaps so; in some cases it may happen so. In a town like Louth, every leader may be expected to be able to ascertain the character of any party seeking admission; that is, if he had any tact whatever. The rule alluded to is not faulty, *per se*; but the method of carrying it out frequently is. If any individual leader has any reasonable doubts concerning the character of a party on trial, he is at liberty to name them before a Leaders' Meeting, which may, in such a case, exercise a veto. I think it exceedingly injurious to interfere unnecessarily with matters of jurisprudence. When this is done, we often find odd men more troublesome and mischievous than wicked men. Over such we ourselves have been called upon to exercise discipline. I assert that *the settlement of 1797 remains a settlement still! We have done away with nothing!* When I was in this circuit, I foresaw that a time would come when the continuance of this usage would prove a cause of conflict,—when this mere veto would grow into a positive demand for power to admit. In some respects we are, as Mr. Larder says, in an anomalous condition. We differ from other denominations in our modes of administration; if it were not so, we should be of them. If you think Dissenters, or Episcopalian, approach nearer New Testament principles than ourselves, *why, then, join them!* In machinery, the fly-wheel is necessary to adjust or ease its movements,—in drawing water from a well, all the strength is required at a certain point, but, by the assistance of a wheel, the difficulty is lessened. Now, there is a large lay agency employed among us. When I come into your circuit, I find your office-bearers have power to remove me away from you at the end of one year, for a mere difference of opinion. I do think that the power you possess should not operate to prevent us using our legitimate power. We think we should sin against God, if, being called, we did not cheerfully leave all to preach the Gospel. We have not merely a nominal, but a real Head, and He so influences the hearts of those who are themselves saved from sin, as to urge them to call us to the sole work of preaching the Gospel. There is, I imagine, a wide difference between those who, having wide scenes of usefulness in the Church open to them, yet remain at home, and, following their worldly callings, have the opportunity of getting riches,—and those who give themselves wholly to the work. Undoubtedly, there are several among our ministers possessed of such talents that, had they used them in the world, they would have forced themselves up into the highest honours; nay, I verily believe we have such amongst us now, who might even have occupied *the Chancellor's wool-sack!** Those who have left all, are differently situated to those who have not; and He who has called them to leave all for his sake and work, has devolved upon them rights and responsibilities peculiar to themselves. The office of the ministry is not

* This is such nonsense as one could hardly have expected a man like Mr. Keeling to give utterance to; and a little calm reflection on the subject must show the folly of all such utterances. The notion seems to be derived from the opinion Mr. Keeling and others have formed of the mental and intellectual capacities of the ministers referred to. Since those men became Methodist ministers, there have been thousands of men at the English bar, whose mental endowments,—to say nothing of their legal acquirements and general learning,—were of a vastly superior order to such Methodist ministers; and yet, out of this very large number of professional men, *only about six* have, or could have, attained the high and distinguished post of Lord Chancellor; viz., Erskine, Eldon, Lyndhurst, Brougham, Cottenham, and Truro. Now, which of these great men was likely to have been supplanted by the most eminent of the Methodist ministers, "had they used their

one into which a man is put as you would put a man into the chair of the professor or lecturer. It would not do for me to say, "I should like to be a preacher!"—that motive would not be sufficiently lofty. I should not only have the external call of the Church, but also the internal impression that I am called of God. While, we trust, we do not set up high sacerdotal claims, we do not labour in the vineyard until approved by you in your local meetings. Now, you have concurrent jurisdiction, but not co-ordinate.—(See Appendix A.)

Mr. GATES thought it would be folly in him to attempt to show what were the usages formerly prevailing in the circuit, as he had only come into it in 1846. At that time, notwithstanding the laws complained of, he found the society in a flourishing state. In that and the two following years, the finances were also in a prosperous condition; so much so, that, by a portion of the Quarterly Meeting, it was deemed desirable to employ a paid lay preacher to assist the four circuit ministers, and to allow him a salary of £52 per annum. He naturally thought this was preliminary to the employment of a fifth minister. In 1849 certain parties came for the express purpose of agitating the society; certain of the leaders and local preachers attended those meetings, and held forth before the public; then followed resolutions that they would not pay, as heretofore, to the maintenance of the ministers; and the consequence is, those ministers have left the circuit considerably short of the amount due to them. Now, the money paid to this lay agent would have satisfied the claims of our preachers. He considered that much of the trouble of the late superintendent was caused by the Leaders' Meeting itself, which factiously refused to deal with a case brought before them, as an experiment, by the superintendent! [Mr. Gates was here complained of by Mr. Larder, and others, who appealed to the chair whether Mr. Gates was in order in giving what he had merely heard from others, he himself not being a member of the Leaders' Meeting, and not, therefore, in a position to state positively the facts of the case. It was ruled that Mr. Gates was out of order.] He therefore proceeded to observe, that, even after the Leaders' Meeting had so far gone with Mr. Stephenson as to embolden him to expel a leader, he had felt afraid to bring other cases forward, lest fresh frivolous objections should be raised. The agitators were then emboldened to hold village meetings throughout the circuit. Great confusion followed, until the leaders manfully interposed, and, in order to restore order, agreed to exert all their influence to stop those meetings, if the preachers would forego disciplinary action and restore tickets to certain persons from whom they had been withheld. Notwithstanding this, numbers of these men continued their agitative proceedings, and even went into the neighbouring circuits. Yes, these men, who had been kindly restored to membership, entered heart and soul into their old work; the superintendent was then obliged to fall back upon his own judgment. Two leaders in a neighbouring village had withdrawn all pecuniary support from the cause, thus practically saying to their members, "Don't pay." Their cases were introduced to the Quarterly Meeting. These men brought no moneys; the meeting demanded that their class-books, which had been very improperly withheld, should be given back unconditionally, without any expression of penitence, or any promise to do better! Then a resolution was put in opposition to the superintendent's will, to the effect, that these men should have their class-books returned: at a Leaders' Meeting, also, a resolution had been proposed by a certain leader, and carried in spite of the protestations of the superintendent.

Mr. LOUTIT: Is it really true that a resolution was not only proposed and seconded, but also put to the meeting by a member of that meeting with the superintendent in the chair?

Mr. SHARPLEY: Mr. Gates has made some remarks in reference to his visits to the meetings held by the Expelled Ministers. I can say I paid no admission-fee to any of these meetings. Perhaps Mr. Gates has done so; and, therefore, knows more about these matters than I do. Now, as to village meetings, they had only been held a fortnight. We used our influence with the superintendent to induce him to restore the deposed officers and members, and promised to exert our influence to check those meetings. This was done. Tickets were restored; and the village meetings ceased.

talents in the world?" With which of them would Mr. Keeling venture to compare his favourite Doctor? Say the Doctor would have made a suitable successor for Mr. Judge Ramshay! but the other is supremely ridiculous. It has been an affliction to the Connexion, that some of our ministers have thought themselves qualified to become lawyers and legislators. Their sphere of mischief has been too large as it is; but if our country had no better rulers than Methodism has had, what its present position would have been is fearful to contemplate.

Only one or two continued to agitate publicly, or visit other circuits. I can safely say Mr. Stephenson was never intimidated. He had no ground for imagining we were wanting in good faith! In reference to the books brought away by Mr. Clulow from the leaders in the country, I still think that was a most objectionable act; and I have yet to learn that it is befitting in any minister, be he who he may—even the President himself—thus to bring away such books in his pocket; and, on his own authority, pronounce the men disqualified for office! Mr. Sharpley then explained the affair of the resolutions put to the Quarterly and Leaders' Meetings, and proved them to be very different in their character to what Mr. Gates had misrepresented them. He also stated that they were not put as substantive resolutions; but merely to gain an expression from the leaders, &c., of their opinion on the question of trying office-bearers as members merely, and of their wish to have the books restored to the leaders.

Mr. LOUTIT: I am generally accustomed to look on the sunny side of the picture; but yet I must conclude, both that there has been great irregularities, and that the office-bearers have been the principal cause.

Dr. BEECHAM: I am at a loss to ascertain whether the Leaders' Meeting requires a leader, who, by his conduct, has forfeited his membership, to be first tried *as a leader*, and then afterwards as a member?—that is, if he has done that which, in the judgment of the superintendent, forfeits his membership?

Mr. SHARPLEY: Certainly, that is the question. In 1811, the question is asked in the Minutes, "What is the moral character of our leaders?" If I am correctly informed, a case in point occurred in the City-road Society. A leader, accused of meddling with Reform matters, was deposed from his office of *leader*, but was allowed to keep his place as a *member*. You preachers have a right to be tried by *your* peers; so have we leaders a right to be tried by *our* peers.

Mr. KEELING: If a preacher is expelled, he is not allowed to meet in class as a member, except by special consent of the Conference.

Mr. SHARPLEY: *Ergo*, a leader being deposed from office is not allowed to retain his membership? You must remember that the court which tries a leader is not the same court which tries a member; it may be composed of the same individuals, but it is not the same court!

Dr. HANNAH thought the fact as to amount of guilt ought first to be decided upon, and then be applied, according to its amount of flagrancy, to the man's leadership or membership.

Mr. SHARPLEY: But it is not so if the Leaders' Meeting gives a verdict against a leader; it might deem the offence to be not of such a character as to render him worthy of expulsion from the society.

Dr. BEECHAM: I don't like on these occasions to cite civil authority; but, according to our judicial practice, when a felon is tried, found guilty, and condemned, his offices avail him nothing, and fall to the ground.

Mr. SHARPLEY: A peer of the realm would be tried by his peers.

Mr. KEELING: Allow me to say, we never do well, when, in the administration of discipline, we come into collision. When we do this, we at once play a game of diamond cut diamond.

The meeting, having sat from ten to half-past two, now adjourned for the purpose of refreshment, until four o'clock; when, the members having assembled, Mr. Keeling, after singing and prayer, delivered himself of the following:—"I feel it on my mind to make a few observations in reference to the wish expressed at the commencement of this meeting, that all parties shall be free and unreserved in their communications. It is reported that in the presence of Englishmen foreigners speak in an under-tone, looking upon the Englishman as a spy, who may be ready to pick up anything he may hear against their Government, and turn it against them. Now, we are not, I conceive, met here to-day on secular business, to consult on parish matters, but as a religious family. I observed this morning that we had a reporter at work! I think it impossible, with such a fact known, there can be free and unreserved communication; there must be some embarrassment; I have felt this. If the person who is now taking notes should afterwards send them to appear in print, he will prove himself wanting in honour! What would be thought of a party introducing himself into the privacy of the domestic circle, and noting and publishing to the world all the conversation that might take place around the family hearth? The expressed wish of the brethren ought to be sufficient to put this down. The person who still persists in taking notes, although he may have a name and place among us, is not one of us!"

Mr. SHARPLEY: I think that the Conference itself would hesitate in forbidding this. I must say I would not myself submit to be placed under an interdict. As to myself,

I feel perfectly indifferent as to what may be reported ; and, even in church matters, I am not one of those who think they ought to be concealed. Mind, I don't advocate the abuse of this liberty ; but I cannot help thinking there may be many of our friends not here to-day, who may be anxious, and who also have an undoubted right, to know what is done.

The PRESIDENT : I hope I shall not say anything of which I am ashamed ; however, I hope the good brother will listen to Mr. Keeling, and cease to write.

Mr. LOUTIT : I must say I had the same feelings in reference to myself, the first Leaders' Meeting I attended at Louth. I then begged of my good brother Boothby not to publish to the world what I had said, observing, that, if he did so, he would wound my feelings. I don't find that he has thus acted. I hope I may rely upon his Christian feeling and Lincolnshire loyalty. It would be an offence to this meeting.

Mr. KEELING : If this is persisted in, then there is an end to the family feeling. Is it not one of the most lamentable features of the times, that, especially on the continent, confidence is destroyed and shyness and distrust everywhere in the ascendant ? There is such a thing as the tyranny of democracy ; and I think it is quite as evil and mischievous as the tyranny of a king.

Mr. SHARPLEY : I would much rather that verbatim reports should be published than that hearsay speeches should be inserted in the *Stamford Mercury*, and afterwards copied into the *Watchman*. I know not what affinity there is between the editors of those two papers ; but my old friend, Mr. Larder, and I have been represented in the *Mercury* as men entertaining Quixotic ideas on the subject of church government, and those misrepresentations have found their way, somehow or other, into the *Watchman*.

Mr. HURLEY : If we take the figure employed by Mr. Keeling, and apply it to this meeting, I think we shall get an important argument in favour of taking notes, and of publishing them too. If a part of a family were to meet together to talk over important matters,—matters in which the whole family were concerned,—those who were absent would like to know, and they would have a right to know, what had been done. Now, we have met together here to talk over important matters,—matters in which the whole Methodist family are in a measure concerned ; but the whole family are not here ; they no doubt, however, will be anxious to know what has occurred, and they have a right to know. I intend to proceed to make a few observations myself ; and, for my part, I am quite unconcerned as to whether they are published or not. I would just state, that I am glad that an opportunity has been afforded of conversing freely, and in a somewhat familiar manner, upon the important questions now at issue, with those who occupy some of the most important offices in our church. As far as the meeting itself is concerned, I must confess, that, to my mind, it would have risen much higher in importance, if by it the questions at issue could have been settled. However, even for such a meeting as the present, I am glad, inasmuch as we are now furnished with an opportunity of vindicating our character as a circuit ; of showing that, instead of having run mad, as we have been represented to be, we are calm, thinking men, having no other object in view than the advancement of the Divine glory in the future peace and prosperity of our beloved church. As officers of the Louth Circuit, I think my brethren will allow me to say, that the first thing with us is personal religion. I believe we are unanimous in our conviction, that were we to succeed in getting the most perfect system of church policy, we should be but poorly rewarded if it was secured at the expense of our personal piety. The next thing in importance with us is the salvation of others, and the removal of whatever may obstruct and hinder the work of God. Now, to be faithful, it does appear to me, and to many of my brethren too, that the position maintained by our Conference respecting the exercise of legislative and judicial power, constitutes one of the most serious and formidable obstructions to the promotion of the best interests of our own church, and to the spread and establishment of Christianity in general. We believe that that position does not harmonise with the nature of man, with the principles of the New Testament, nor with the spirit of the dispensation under which we live. For Conference to claim the exclusive exercise to this power, while by far the greater part of the labour is done by lay officers, we think, is tantamount to "muzzling the ox that treadeth out the corn." While this power is claimed by our ministers, I presume they can scarcely imagine that agitation will cease. They might, perhaps, by the adoption of certain means, succeed in allaying the present agitation ; but what of that ? If the cause of agitation still remained, there would still be an under-current of dissatisfaction, which would swell and widen until it burst again, so that we should have agitation and expulsions by thousands, as a sort of periodical event. And what

is more to be deprecated? Who can reflect upon the removal of upwards of 50,000 from our church during the past year, without feeling what he cannot express? Depend upon it, there is a fearful amount of responsibility resting somewhere. I confess that I cannot help coming to the conclusion, that the greater part of that responsibility rests upon the shoulders of those who had the power to remove the cause upwards of a year ago, but who refused to do it. For my part I envy not their position. Our ministers say they are sincere in their belief that the power they claim is their Scriptural right. Well, be it so: we, on the other hand, are equally sincere in our belief that it is not! How, then, is the question to be decided? I say, by neither party separately. In my opinion it ought to be settled by a fair representation of the entire Connexion—ministers and people. *I would suggest that the President allow each circuit, by one of its Quarterly Meetings, to elect a representative; and, in order to give general satisfaction, I would suggest that all officers who have been expelled for taking part in the present contest be invited to vote in the election of the representatives of their respective circuits; and that such representatives be allowed to meet the committee of preachers appointed by the last Conference to sit during the year,—who are, I presume, a fair representation of the Conference,—and let that meeting discuss and settle all the questions now at issue.* It does appear to me that it would be no degradation either to the ministers on the one hand, or to the people on the other, to abide by the decision of such a meeting. And, now, before I sit down, I should like to ask Dr. Beecham a question, one which was asked this morning, but one to which no answer was given. According to the Irish Minutes, no one can be expelled without the concurrence of a Leaders' Meeting. This, it appears, is sanctioned by the English Conference, and yet in our Minutes it is more than intimated, that to allow such a thing would be sinful. So that by the same parties, what is apparently sanctioned in one place, would be considered sinful in another. If this is the case, it appears to me to affect the sincerity of Conference; therefore, I should be glad if Dr. Beecham will reconcile this apparent inconsistency.

Dr. BEECHAM: We are not an Irish, but an English, Conference. If you would have Irish Methodism, then you must throw away many of the guards you possess as English Methodists! You must take the thing as a whole.

Mr. LOUTIT: Certainly. If you would have a part of Irish Methodism, you must have the whole, and I should think our friend would be the first to discard the part rather than to take the whole!

Mr. KEELING: I have my doubts as to whether the English Minute referred to is so strong as has been represented.

Mr. HURLEY: I will read it.

The Minute was then read, after which the ministers present called in question the accuracy of the quotation, although given from the Minutes *verbatim*!

Mr. HURLEY: If needful I will read it again.

Mr. KEELING: There is no need for that. It is no difficult matter to twit any large and influential body with inconsistency; we cannot be supposed to be answerable for what the Irish Conference do! They are our agents! You might, with equal ease and inconsistency, twit any other large body with insincerity, even the House of Lords itself! I have my doubts as to whether the Irish Minute grants as much power to the leaders as it is supposed it does.

Mr. SHARPLEY: The Irish Minute contains these words: "No member shall be removed from society without the concurrence (inserted in capital letters) of a Leaders' Meeting."

Mr. LOUTIT: You have this concurrence.

Mr. SHARPLEY: I deny it! it is what we want.

Dr. HANNAH: Supposing that the said resolution of the Irish Conference was in one instance only inserted, is that deemed to be affirmed by or binding on all Conferences? It was never inserted in our Minutes! The Irish preachers are a noble race of men, but we are not to be bound by what they may do. It is more than probable that the Minute was entered hastily, and, consequently, not with the happiest choice of words.

Mr. KEELING: Every one must see that if large bodies in different years and different localities do not agree pretty closely in every matter, they are not clearly chargeable with the crime of insincerity.

Mr. SHARPLEY: I feel quite sure that Dr. Hannah, with his honesty and sincerity so well known, would not be guilty of a known deception.

Dr. BEECHAM: The English Conference has never given its sanction to the interpretation attempted by some to be put upon this law. Many ministers who agreed to

the framing of it, now sincerely regret having given their countenance to that which they now find it quite impracticable to carry out.

Mr. SHARPLEY: I cannot conceive how any President should sit in a Conference and allow such a resolution to be entered in the Minutes, and by signing them appear to assent to them, while, at the same time, he dissented from them. Any man who can put any other construction on the rule than we do, must be obtuse.

Dr. BEECHAM: I again repeat that our Conference has again and again, in the presence of the Irish representative, expressed its disapprobation of the Irish rule referred to. We believe that we, as ministers, are acting in accordance with New Testament principles.

Mr. HURLEY: I think the remarks just made by Dr. Beecham furnish, so far as the sincerity of Conference is concerned, a satisfactory answer to my question.

Dr. BEECHAM: I am glad that you are so far satisfied.—(*See Appendix B.*)

Mr. KEELING: I do not think it necessarily follows that, because a President signs the Minutes of the Conference over which he presides, he, therefore, agrees with every word and every act that has passed. I should feel it my duty to submit to any majority in everything not essential.

Mr. SHARPLEY: Ay, that's the point; a thing is essential, if it can be proved to be Scriptural.

Mr. KEELING: I hope Mr. Sharpley will forgive my freedom, when I say that, if I were appointed to this circuit, I should be incapable of giving up that which you ask for.

Dr. BEECHAM: At my years, I think I shall not easily take offence; yet I think it a bold and fearful thing to accuse so excellent and laborious a class of ministers of insincerity.

Mr. HURLEY: I beg to say that, as far as I am concerned, I am anxious to give our ministers credit for sincerity; that is the very reason why I asked the question.

Mr. LOUTIT: I hope the excellent deputation, after what took place this morning, will believe that we all wish to act in unison,—that we intend there shall be no shyness between us and the people. Whatever else may take place, I hope that, so far as practical matters are concerned,—such as our ministering to the people of our spiritual treasures, and they to us of their temporal ones,—we shall present the lovely spectacle of faith, love, and charity blending and working harmoniously together.

Mr. SHARPLEY: If I could gain the preachers over to my way of thinking, by stopping the supplies, I should hesitate to employ such means. If ministers cannot be influenced by argument, then let them continue to entertain their sentiments. They have as much right to their opinions as I have to mine. I think our friends are mistaken in this matter of contributions. I rejoice that our ministers preach pure doctrine. This is a great thing. Our class-meetings, prayer-meetings, and band-meetings are all continued to us. I think we ought to hesitate before we sacrifice these for the sake of better discipline.

Mr. GILLIAT: Much has been said this afternoon about sincerity. The President and our newly-appointed preachers may depend upon it that our late superintendent gave me cause to question his sincerity.

Mr. PLASKITT: I sincerely hope we shall determine from this day to do the best we can; but I must be allowed an observation or two. We have a society in this circuit composed of forty members, with two leaders, and none of these are acknowledged, but are repudiated by the preachers. The fact is, the leaders' books have been withheld from them by the preachers, and the members left without tickets. Is this legal? (No answer.) I think things are more promising than they were. Nevertheless, we have never been so bad as some have laboured to make us, but several of our friends, I am persuaded, have acted differently to that they would have done had they been more kindly treated.

Mr. LOUTIT: This is not a judicial tribunal. I have always made it a rule to submit to a majority, except in matters of conscience. You expect me to be kind towards you; I shall look for a return of kindness from you. If these leaders are disposed to meet us, they will find us not indisposed to meet them.

Mr. PLASKITT: I ask the question of the President, whether any preacher has an abstract right to bring away a leader's book, without consulting a Leaders' or Quarterly Meeting? It is a thing, in my opinion, unheard of,—perfectly un-Methodistical.

Dr. HANNAH: As I am appealed to, I would respectfully say, I can give no opinion on the matter: first, because I am not in possession of the whole of the facts of the case; secondly, because it would not be courteous to discuss the affair in the absence of Mr. Stephenson; and, thirdly, because the whole matter is in kind hands!

Mr. PLASKITT: I put to you a straightforward question. Has any minister a right to take away the book of any leader, under any pretence whatever, without the sanction of any other party? I wish for your opinion.

Mr. LOUTIT: This amounts to a charge against Mr. Stephenson, or Mr. Clulow.

Mr. KEELING would also hesitate to give an opinion in the absence of the superintendent. He then compared the conduct of supply-stoppers to the boys in the fable, who, for sport's sake, pelted the frogs with stones; and said the preachers might say with the frogs, "What is sport to you, is death to us." You are playing a game which may end in the overthrow of our institutions. Mr. Keeling then, at some length, described the situation of his brother (recently deceased) among agitating Reformers, and unhesitatingly attributed his death to the Reformers.—(See Appendix C.)

Mr. BACON: I am thankful for the kindly tone which pervades the meeting. If this is continued afterwards, it will have a good effect in the circuit: it will also not be without its influence on the neighbouring circuits. Louth is looked up to by them as a something which they themselves ought to be.

Mr. T. MAWER congratulated the deputation on the urbanity and kindness of their demeanour, and the meeting generally on the good feeling existing; but yet he was inclined to find fault with one or two little matters. "Why," he said, "was not Mr. Sharpley on the Missionary Committee? His devotedness to the mission cause was well known, and he was also the district treasurer." He also complained of Dr. Beecham for not inviting a Delegate from Louth to his great Manchester Meeting, and hoped that, in the intended lay-meeting, Louth would be properly represented!

Dr. BEECHAM, on being called upon by the President, rose to say how delighted he was with many of the sentiments that had been uttered. I am (he said) a Lincolnshire man, and I have confidence in Lincolnshire Methodism. I have taken a deep interest in the state of this important circuit, and I assure you it has caused me to feel many fears and to breathe many prayers. I have ardently desired that the circuit might be restored to its former healthy state. It was truly a Model Circuit. I am anxious that you should give us credit for honesty and upright motives—for being actuated by honest principles. We are not obstinately striving to have our own way; we are not aiming to introduce novelties among you; we have nothing new to offer. The principles included in the Laws of 1797, and what have prevailed here since that time, we have uniformly endeavoured to maintain. We have a sacred deposit handed down to us from our fathers, and we cannot afford to throw away that which has been Methodism from the beginning. Not that we wish to throw around us the garment of authority, but because we really feel it to be our bounden duty to maintain the sacred deposit inviolate. Many of our esteemed brethren, the local preachers, hold the same opinion with ourselves. Mr. Smith, of Camborne, one of the number, forcibly illustrates these principles; and I only wish you would read attentively his most excellent work on the "Constitution of Methodism." We do not want to encroach. I speak the sentiments of the President and the bulk of my brethren in Conference, when I say, that this has been Methodism from the beginning, and is strictly in accordance with the Word of God. It would afford me high satisfaction if my friends at Louth, whom I highly respect and love, could be induced to see these matters as we see them. Believe me, my dear brethren, when I say, by our principles we must stand at all hazards! Don't think any worse of us, when we say emphatically, "We cannot give them up!" This is no minor matter. Great principles are involved in it. And what if we even do carry out our plans according to our own views? How can this militate against all your privileges, so interestingly described by Mr. Sharpley? You still have your band-meetings, your class-meetings, and your prayer-meetings. The means of grace are abundantly open to you. These remain in all their fulness. I only regret that we do not more frequently and profitably attend those several means. I do not; and, if I were to ask the question of the leaders and local preachers around me, "Do you?" I feel persuaded the general answer would be "No!" Then look at the opportunities for usefulness presented by Methodism to its lay agents,—its local preachers, leaders, prayer-leaders, &c., &c. After all, *soul-saving is the principal thing*,—the salvation of ourselves, our families, and our neighbours. If anything is wrong in Methodism (and what human system is perfect in all its parts?) let it be righted; but let it be done in a deliberate and Christian manner. Imperfection attaches to all human systems. It is the life of God in the soul we more especially need. Let us take care to have it, and to maintain it. Let us be on our guard, lest the enemy occupy our minds with considerations about the anise, mint, and cummin. I trust we shall go away from this auspicious meeting, all of us hoping and praying for the very best results to

follow. Depend upon it, we shall not recommend Mr. Loutit to brandish ministerial authority before you.

So ended this remarkable meeting, each party expressing themselves pretty well satisfied with the interview and conversation, especially with the Christian spirit and conduct of the President; and neither party in the least inclined apparently to give up those principles for which they have been so long and earnestly contending.—(See Appendix D.)

Messrs. Newton and Scott, who were appointed by Conference to form a part of the deputation, were from some cause prevented from being present.

A P P E N D I X .

APPENDIX A.

THE RIGHT OF LEADERS' MEETINGS.

To the Editor of THE WESLEYAN TIMES.

DEAR SIR,—I perceive, by the account in THE WESLEYAN TIMES of the meeting at Louth, that the preachers repudiate the practice of the leaders admitting or expelling members by their vote. Now, I have many times been present, some years ago, at Leaders' Meetings, and given my vote on those occasions; and, in proof of the truth of the doctrine held by the Louth moderates, I send for your information a few extracts from the "Methodist Manual," by the Rev. Jonathan Crowther, dated Halifax, 1810—which, although it cannot be called law, yet clearly details the usage at the time when it was written, and, I believe, was never, as a book, disowned by the Conference.

At page 130, under "Admission into the Society," is the following:—"The superintendent has power to admit *on trial* persons recommended by a leader with whom they have met, and to give notes of admittance, or permission to love-feasts, of his own mere authority. Yet, in all doubtful cases, prudence directs him to consult such as are most likely to furnish him with the necessary information. But, before any person receives a quarterly society-ticket, our rule requires that the case be mentioned at the Leaders' Meeting, and that a majority of the leaders present avowedly or tacitly agree; that is, that they do not object to such person being admitted a member of society."

Again, under head, "A Leader's Office," amongst other things, page 132, he says:—"Giving his vote upon any proposal for the exclusion or admission of a member of society." And also, page 133, under the head, "Leaders' Meeting," we have:—"A LEADERS' MEETING is for the purpose of paying in the weekly class-money, paying the preacher his weekly-board, looking over the class-papers, conversing and determining respecting persons proposed for admission into society, or any whose continuance in society is rendered doubtful, whether through neglecting to meet their classes, or any charges brought against their conduct."

From these extracts it is clear that the new-fangled, Popish doctrine of the power of the keys was neither known nor thought of as Methodist doctrine and a sacred trust, in the year 1810, and is of modern invention; that the men of Louth are *right*, and that the Conference, with all its pretended infallibility, is *wrong*.

I thought, that, as the volume from which the above extracts are made is scarce, and may not have come under your notice, you might, perhaps, make some use of them.—Yours, truly,

JOHN TAYLOR.

York, October 16th, 1851.

APPENDIX B.

IRISH METHODISM DISAPPROVED OF BY THE BRITISH CONFERENCE.

To the Editor of THE WESLEYAN TIMES.

DEAR SIR,—The proceedings during the late visit of the President, Dr. Beecham, and others, to the officers of the Louth Circuit, are certainly very far from being flattering to the *Irish* Conference. Our Irish preachers "are mere agents of the

British Conference, and we are not answerable for what they do," said the Rev. I. Keeling. The President agreed with Mr. Keeling. In other words, the Irish preachers, when met in Conference, are such a bungling set of men, that the British Conference cannot recognise or sanction their proceedings; "and are, therefore, not bound by what they may do." "They adopt resolutions without proper consideration; and they are such an ignorant race of men as to be unable to make such a selection of words as would properly express what they mean." So thought the erudite Dr. Hannah. Not very complimentary, indeed; and yet, in the Irish Conference, are to be found such men as W. P. Applebe, LL.D.,—not a mushroom Doctor of Divinity,—at whose feet Mr. President Hannah might sit with great advantage to himself. "Again and again," said Dr. Beecham, "has our Conference, in the *presence* of the *Irish* representatives, expressed its *disapprobation* of the *Irish* rule referred to."

But although our Irish Conference is thus thrown overboard by the English, and although our preachers are so illiterate as to be unable to express their opinions or laws in suitable phraseology, yet there is one thing which they have done, and which their English brethren were *mean* enough to allow them to do, and to avail themselves of. They subscribed last year, out of their penury, £200 towards the support of their better paid brethren who thus denounce them. Yes, the Irish preacher, out of his miserable allowance of £16 per annum, had to subscribe his mite to enable his Saxon reverence to have his full £200 or £300 per annum. Little as they had, they gave of that little towards the maintenance of priestly intolerance in England,—intolerance which has already riven Methodism from its centre to its circumference. For this the English Conference expresses no "disapprobation;" but the Irish Methodist people do. They think that their preachers might have made a better use of their free-will offerings than by giving them to support priestly despotism.

It may be inquired, What is the law which is thus so severely censured? Is it of recent date? and has its operation been injurious to Methodism? Quite the contrary. It has been in use for many years; and, in pursuance of it, our Irish preachers and leaders have acted most harmoniously together in maintaining the discipline of the society. It provides, "That no member (or leader) shall be removed from society without the *concurrence* of a Leaders' Meeting."

Against this law (which very properly gives the leaders a vote, not only in reference to the guilt or innocence of an accused brother, but as to the amount of punishment to be awarded in the event of a conviction) has the British Conference (if Dr. Beecham be correct) raised its voice repeatedly. It may be asked, Why is this? What can be objectionable in such a law? Have the Irish leaders in any one instance availed themselves of it factiously to screen the guilty, or to retain in office any office-bearers or members *proved* to be guilty of immorality? I answer, No. Why, then, have the British Conference condemned it? Why, simply because *it deprives the superintendent preacher of the power of excluding from the Church of Christ better men than himself*,—men who, like Mr. Gandy, would be (to use his reverend executioner's language) "an ornament to any Christian Church, although unfit for Methodism." The expulsion of such men, and the loss of 56,000 members, ought surely to convince our English brethren that a rule which gives the Leaders' Meetings such a salutary control over the superintendent is absolutely necessary for the wellbeing of Methodism. Are not the leaders just as competent to form an opinion *pro* or *con* of a brother's character as a preacher can be? Have they not opportunities, year after year, of judging of the walk and conversation of the members of society, which no birds of passage, such as our preachers are, could have? In fact, look at the matter in any way you please, and it must be admitted that our leaders are just as competent to decide who shall, and who shall not, be members of society as are the preachers.

Dr. Hannah stated that "it was more than probable that the minute was *entered hastily*, and, consequently, not with the happiest choice of words." No such thing; this Jesuitical statement is the very opposite of truth. In 1812 our Irish Conference adopted, under the *sanction* of an *English* President, a resolution, "That they would collect and publish all the laws relating to the discipline of the Irish Connexion." Accordingly those laws were collected and submitted for approval to the Conference of 1813. If the law referred to was, as Dr. Hannah states, "entered so hastily," and expressed so badly, why was it not *then* corrected? Surely there could not be a more favourable opportunity for doing so, but no alteration whatever was made in it. It received the sanction of *that* Conference, and of its *English* President, Dr. Coke, and was, with the other laws, ordered to be published, which was accordingly done by the Methodist Book-room, Whitefriars-street; and I have also seen a copy of that publication, which Mr. Craig produced on his trial. So much for the truthfulness of the

President's opinion. It is quite evident, either that he wished to deceive the meeting, or was utterly ignorant of what he was speaking about.

The British Conference of 1797 (see Minutes, vol i., page 378) evidently conceded the principles involved in this rule. Hence it states: "In short, brethren, out of our great love for peace and union, and our great desire to satisfy your minds, *we* have given up to *you* by far the *greatest part* of the *superintendent's authority*." Yet, in the face of this rule, and of this plain statement of the British Conference, Dr. Beecham had the hardihood to assert that "the Laws of 1797 were certainly never intended to give into the hands of the leaders a *part* of that, the whole of which God himself had committed (where is it so recorded in his Word ?) to his own ministers, and to *no one else*." "That would involve a principle," said he, "we could *never admit*."

Our Irish preachers think differently ; and, notwithstanding all the censure and disapprobation which has been heaped upon them by some of their English brethren, they have to the present faithfully adhered to the rule which gave the Leaders' Meeting the authority and jurisdiction conceded to it in 1797. Even Mr. Reilly, anxious as he was to please the Clique by Mr. Craig's expulsion, would not, although he violated our laws and usages in other respects, attempt to do it in this ; hence, when by availing himself of English law, he had succeeded in obtaining a verdict against that brother, by packing the Leaders' Meeting with trustees, he stood up and said : "It becomes my duty now to suggest to the meeting the manner in which Brother Craig should be dealt with. I will, on this point, resort to *Irish Law!!!* in the Minutes of 1812, which provides that a leader cannot be removed from office without the approbation of a Leaders' Meeting. I, therefore, propose that he be suspended from the office of leader," &c. ; which proposition was accordingly submitted to the meeting for its adoption.

Here let me ask the President and Dr. Beecham, Have not the leaders, as a body, evinced more anxiety about the moral character and purity of their brethren than have the preachers ? What Leaders' Meeting would allow a man who was known to be an habitual drunkard to retain the office of leader? Not one. Yet, I know of more than one instance of a preacher, who was a notorious drunkard, being permitted for years to preach, and to administer the sacraments. Mr. Mathews, the present chairman of the Dublin district, told me, in reference to one of those individuals, who lodged in the same house with him in this city, that "night after night he was in the habit of coming home in a state of beastly intoxication, that he often feared he would set the house on fire, and that, on one occasion, he would certainly have been smothered, were it not that he (Mr. Mathews) had providentially gone into his room." Yet *that man was appointed to some of our very best circuits !!* If that man had been a leader, would his brethren have allowed him to retain office ?

Very recently one of our Irish preachers was accused of gross immorality. Whether the accusation were true or false I know not ; but, after travelling upwards of twenty years, his name was, in 1850, left off the Minutes. Yet, Mr. Reilly, who was so anxious to exercise "godly discipline" in Mr. Craig's case, allows that man to minister in holy things, and to fill his pulpits, in the Carlow Circuit. Would a leader, under such circumstances, be allowed to meet a class or conduct a meeting ?

Again, see Mr. M'Afee's case. Only imagine a preacher of the Gospel sitting down *deliberately* to write such an amount of profanity, lying, and slander, as is contained in his letter to the *Watchman*, of the 12th December, 1849, and then ascending a pulpit to exhort his hearers to "go on to perfection," and to "follow after those things which are lovely and of good report." Is it not monstrous? Would a leader who so conducted himself be retained in office? Not so. Yet he has not only been retained, but promoted ; and Dr. Bunting and his party, in order to mark their approval of a letter which Dr. Dixon described as being that of "a person ignorant of the courtesies of life, unused to the civilities of civilised society," and to be "the letter of a butcher," invited him over to London to preach the anniversary sermons of the Missionary Society, and to take a part in the public meeting in Exeter-hall. The indignation of the audience, however, prevented the latter from taking place.

Again, I might refer to Mr. Stamp's case, to the case of the young preacher, who, in a fit of intoxication, lately broke the windows of his superintendent's house; of another, who savagely ill-treated his servant-maid, and was punished for it by the civil power, &c., &c. Would leaders who followed the example set them by such men, be permitted to retain office? Not one of them. My brethren, the leaders have too much respect for themselves, and too great an anxiety for God's cause, to allow anything of the kind. Yet the men who sanction such doings, coolly turn round and inform us, that "the ministers of God are our judges, but we are not to judge them."

They, forsooth, are the only parties to whom the keys of the fold are entrusted, or who are worthy to be allowed to have the control of such "a sacred deposit !!!"

In consequence of the revelations made by Dr. Beecham, it behoves my brethren, the Irish leaders, to be on the alert, otherwise the British Conference will, in order to support its priestly dignity, insist on our Conference depriving us of the advantages resulting from the Law referred to in the Minutes of 1812, a proceeding which would be fatal to the best interests of Methodism. In Ireland well would it be for preachers and people if we were altogether separated from the English Conference, and thereby saved from the baneful influence which it exercises over us. Let them retain the £1,100 or so, which they dole out to us as paupers, and let us retain, for the furtherance of the work of God, the £4,000 or £5,000 per annum, which we send over to be squandered at the Mission-house.—Your obedient servant,

A TRUSTEE AND LEADER, NORTH DUBLIN CIRCUIT.

Dublin, 14th October, 1851.

APPENDIX C.

THE REV. ISAAC KEELING AND HIS BROTHER'S DEATH.

From THE WESLEYAN TIMES.

THE Conference Clique, in all their contests with the Reformers, will be found to address themselves to those who are supposed to be moved less by principle than by feeling, and more by prejudice than by reason. Among other charges, by advancing which they have sought to lower honourable opponents in the eyes of such persons, they have not scrupled to include that of *murder*. In several instances, the decease of Travelling Preachers who have departed this life since the commencement of our unhappy disputes, has been deliberately laid at the door of the Reformers in the circuits where they died.

Now, on former occasions, we have not condescended to notice these rash imputations. Nor, although we observed that the Rev. Isaac Keeling, when at Louth, attributed the death of his brother to the annoyance which he experienced from the Reformers at Barnsley, had we any thought of breaking that dignified silence which is, perhaps, the only proper answer to such charges. But we have scarcely a choice in the matter. This last calumny is so unfounded, that persons acquainted with the facts cannot refrain from exposing the passionate attempt of Mr. Isaac Keeling to mislead the Methodist public. In this instance, we believe, we must forego our strong objections to taking notice of affirmations, which are, on the face of them, the mere dictates of blind and unreflecting resentment. Accordingly, we shall give insertion to two letters on the subject, from individuals qualified and entitled to speak. The first is from Mr. Joseph S. Bulmer, of Whitby, a surgeon, who, in conjunction with Mr. N. S. Sadler, also a member of the same profession, made a *post mortem* examination of the remains of the Rev. Ralph R. Keeling.

"Grape-lane, Whitby, October 15, 1851.

"DEAR SIR,—Being a subscriber to your valuable, but much-abused, paper, I find that the Rev I. Keeling has been charging the Wesleyan Reformers of Barnsley with having caused his brother's death. As I, along with N. S. Sadler, Esq., surgeon, made a *post mortem* examination of his body, I beg to inform you, for the benefit of your readers, that his death was the natural and inevitable result of causes which had been in operation many years. The upper division of the abdomen presented a mass of morbid adhesions and deposits. There was also constriction of the stomach. The kidneys were congested, and filled with coagulated blood; indeed there was scarcely any organ of his body that was not more or less diseased. His brother, perhaps, will be condescending enough to inform your readers how the Reformers could produce all this mischief. But the fact is, sir, his own friends know better. I myself was informed by one of them that he had not been able for some years to take a circuit where it was necessary for him to ride on horseback, and, when in Barnsley, he invariably either walked to his country appointments or rode in a gig.

"That the death of the Rev. R. R. Keeling may have been accelerated two or three weeks by mental agitation, I am not prepared to dispute; but, at the same time, it is well known that the agitation in the Barnsley Circuit was caused by the Rev. R. R. Keeling himself, by his unrighteous and unjustifiable proceedings in the expulsion of Mr. H. Bell and other pious and talented office-bearers in the society. Had he wished for peace, he should have refrained from inquisitorial, agitative, and divisive proceedings himself.—I am, sir, yours, respectfully,

"JOSEPH S. BULMER."

After a statement so clear, and made on such high authority, there can, of course, be no more question as to the causes of Mr. Keeling's death. Mr. Bulmer, it will have been noticed, adverts to the expulsion of Mr. Henry Bell by the deceased minister. Our second letter is from that gentleman; and the fine tone of Christian charity and forbearance in which he writes, will, we hope, operate as a mild but effective rebuke to the very opposite spirit which the surviving brother appears to cherish:—

“ Barnsley, October 17, 1851.

“ DEAR SIR,—Immediately on reading, in your last week's paper, that Mr. Isaac Keeling had stated, at Louth, that his late brother's death was owing to the Reformers, I wrote to him to inquire whether the report was correct, and, if not, requesting him to allow me to contradict it. Having had no reply, I conclude that the report is correct, and that he made the statement referred to; which I must characterise as not only a most rash and uncharitable assertion, but also as a foul, false, and slanderous imputation on the Reformers of this circuit, which we neither can nor will allow to pass unchecked, as there is the clearest possible evidence that Mr. Keeling's death was not owing at all, nor in any degree, to the agitation, but was the result of deep-seated, extensive, and long-continued organic disease. Indeed, the surgeons who made the *post-mortem* examination expressed their astonishment, after the examination, that he should have lived so long. As Mr. Isaac Keeling must have known this, I am astonished that he should have given utterance to the statement which is attributed to him.

“ There is no doubt that the late Mr. Keeling felt considerable anxiety on account of the agitation now existing throughout our Connexion; and what truly devoted minister is there amongst us, I would ask, that does not? Is it any wonder that they should feel deeply distressed when they behold between fifty and sixty thousand precious and immortal souls—redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, and gathered into church fellowship by the labour of years—expelled, scattered, and driven away; and, with regard to many, it is to be feared for ever? Not, be it remembered, for any violation of the law of God. Wero it so, it would have been some justification of their proceedings, and some alleviation of their distress; but merely because the Reformers had endeavoured to remedy certain flagrant evils, which they were plainly convinced existed in our church, and which they felt it their bounden and imperative duty to do. I can easily conceive how such proceedings, when seriously reflected on, in the light of eternity, must have produced deep and painful anxiety in the mind of a pious and conscientious minister, such as I believe the late Mr. Keeling to have been. Had he been unfettered by the pledge (which is required from, and given by, every Superintendent) to carry out Conference discipline, and to which he considered himself bound to adhere, I cannot but think he would not only have acted differently towards the Reformers, but would have enjoyed much more satisfaction and peace of mind, and would also have had the pleasure of beholding the circuit in peace and spiritual prosperity; for, if we could not all have seen eye to eye, we could and would have continued to work together to promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and we should not then have been, as now we are, a divided and wrecked circuit.

“ However, as Mr. Isaac Keeling has merely made a general statement, unsupported by proof, I will content myself at present by giving it a general, but a positive and emphatic, denial; and, from a regard to the memory of our late superintendent (whom, in his general deportment, I highly esteemed), and from a regard to the feelings of his bereaved family, I will not refer to any particulars in support of my denial, unless Mr. Isaac Keeling should attempt to establish his assertion; in which case, I doubt not that I can clearly and satisfactorily show that it is entirely without foundation.—I am, dear sir,
yours, truly,

“ HENRY BELL.”

Thus we see, that, although the deceased preacher had expelled Mr. Bell from society, he cherishes towards his memory none but the most charitable and Christian sentiments. From the esteem which he expresses for him as a pious and conscientious minister, it is presumable that Mr. Keeling's anxieties were caused by the destructive lengths to which matters had been carried by his own brethren, rather than by any difficulties created by those Reformers with whom he had himself to deal. As Mr. Bell justly observes, the present state of our Connexion is such, that none, whether preachers or people, can be without great solicitude, unless, indeed, they be past all feeling. We have not a doubt, that, on both sides, where adequate morbid predispositions existed, anxiety may have precipitated the catastrophe of dissolution; but we should hold it utterly unwarrantable to charge the responsibility upon the Conference party of any such death occurring among the Reformers. We think it quite sufficient to arraign the Clique, and their agents, on account of what they do wittingly, purposing a certain result; leaving them, as to the remoter consequences of their actions, in the hands of a Judge who, without possibility of error or mistake, can trace causes to all their effects, and can apportion to every man his exact share of responsibility. We hope, therefore, that we shall hear no more of these random accusations of constructive murder, and particularly about the death of Mr. Ralph R. Keeling, in order—as Mr. Bell so considerately suggests—to spare the lacerated

feelings of his bereaved family. Who can doubt that the emancipated spirit of their lamented head is now before the throne of God and of the Lamb, where he sees the subjects of hot disputation among his former religious connections, in a light in which it were devoutly to be wished that they too could see them ?

APPENDIX D.

REMARKS ON THE LOUTH MEETING.

This Louth meeting deserves the serious attention of Methodists of all parties. It affords a higher test of the temper of the Clique than anything else of recent occurrence. We do not use that word in its ordinary acceptation. On both sides, the conversation was carried on, not merely without anger, but in the most amicable spirit. But mildness of manner was all the Deputation had to offer the expectant circuit. After talking down the sun, parties separated, each as firm and unbending as when the debate began, and neither disposed to abate a jot. Now, what gives to this fruitless conference its peculiar significance in our eyes, arises out of the circumstance, that the persons with whom the Deputation came to confer were not thorough-going Reformers, but belong to what may be called the moderate party in Methodism. They took pains to distinguish themselves from the Delegates ; avowed their entire disapprobation of the stopping of supplies ; and, instead of demanding extensive changes, appeared willing to be satisfied with the very minimum of concession. And yet, the President and the Ex-President left Louth as unwilling to listen to them as to the Delegates themselves. On the other hand, the Louth people have a peculiarly strong case. It is beyond all question, that, in their Circuit, the practice has, until of late, been in accordance with the Regulations of 1797. The Travelling Preachers fence with this difficulty, but they cannot surmount it. And yet, while obliged tacitly to allow that things are so, they go away, insisting that, in Louth, as well as elsewhere, everything must bow to the "supreme pastorate." If, then, to a circuit which unites as much in renouncing the more offensive features of the Reform Movement, as in contending for its own established usages, the trusty agents of the Clique are instructed to present as forbidding a front as if it went all lengths, both as to the amount demanded and the manner of demanding it,—what possible hope can there be that they will ever yield to anything short of downright moral compulsion ?

Mr. Sharpley, who stated the case of the circuit with so much courtesy and good feeling, must, we are persuaded, have left the meeting under the conviction that the Deputation were wholly impervious to such considerations as ought to have swayed their judgment. The three points which formed the chief subjects of controversy were, the question of the right of all the Travelling Preachers in the circuit to be present and vote at one and the same Leaders' Meeting ; the extent of the authority of the Leaders' Meeting in reference to the admission of members ; and the legality or illegality of trying as a member any person in office as a leader.

"It will be better," suggested the President, at the opening of the discussion, "not to occupy time by entertaining individual cases of discipline." Why it would have been impossible to do anything without. It was precisely in an individual case of discipline that the late Superintendent endeavoured to swamp the Leaders' Meeting by the introduction of his three colleagues. Now, this was notoriously contrary to the established usage in Louth. But see how craftily Mr. Keeling tries to help his successor over the stile. "I think it is probable," observes that ingenious gentleman, "that the usage of only one preacher being present at a trial, may have originated from the circumstance of only one preacher being generally at home." Indeed ! That is curious, when Mr. Stephenson could work the circuit so as to insure the attendance of *three* besides himself ! The sum of the matter is this : according to Mr. Sharpley, if four preachers are allowed to be present during disciplinary proceedings, they can overwhelm every society in the circuit except Louth itself ; and the office-bearers, in the name of the members, refuse to give up this point.

With respect to the authority of Leaders' Meetings in the admission of members, it was stated by Mr. Larder, a gentleman of high character and long experience, that the Leaders' Meetings in Louth, as well as in other circuits, had been in the habit of receiving members, with the sanction and approbation of successive Superintendents, for a long series of years ; who, so far from making objections, used to inquire, "Brethren, have you any members to propose ?" This continued till the year 1840 ; before which it was no unusual thing for five or six members at a time to be intro-

duced into the Society through the Leaders' Meeting. In that year, however, they were interfered with. "We felt," says Mr. Larder, with much significance, "that we had got something upon our necks." And, in short, the least that will give them relief from this galling pressure, is a return, in good faith, to the ancient usage,—in other words, to the Regulations of 1797. Now, mark how the Ex-President,—whose every word derives emphasis from the imperturbable composure with which it is uttered,—mark, we say, how Dr. Beecham meets this! "The Laws of 1797," he says, "were certainly never intended to give into the hands of the Leaders a part of that, the whole of which God himself has committed to his own ministers and to none else." "That would involve a principle *we could never admit.*" But the Laws of 1797 were plainly intended, the Conference itself being witness, to give up into the hands of the official meetings "the far greater part of the superintendent's authority." But, not needlessly to enlarge upon a point on which to speak as Dr. Beecham is reported to have done, betrays a temerity of which we scarcely deemed him capable, let us listen to Mr. Larder's further statement of *facts* in reference to the Louth Circuit. "We believe," he replies, "that, if the leaders pronounce a man unfit to become a member of society, he ought not to be admitted. Why, *it was our custom to publish publicly from the pulpit the names of members proposed, lest we should be imposed upon.* I do not sit in this vestry as a leader for nothing. I deem myself to be in some measure responsible for the character of the members received into society. But, during the last eleven years, I have known several persons admitted on the recommendation of a single leader, *who would not have been received had they been brought before twenty or thirty leaders.* We do not by any means consider we are encroaching, when, one being allowed to recommend, or otherwise, we ask that twenty or thirty should assent, or be allowed to dissent." "This," adds Mr. Sharpley, "is our usage. Before a preacher gives a ticket to a member on trial, that member on trial is proposed at a Leaders' Meeting; that Leaders' Meeting exercises its veto; the Leaders' Meeting does not actually receive the person into society. If our veto is given, the preacher does not admit; if we do not object, he is then received. *It used to be our practice, that members, when proposed, were named publicly before a Society Meeting; and this was repeated when he was accepted.*" Now, the more advanced Reformers have been often taxed with "leaning too much towards Independency," because they have proposed to give the Societies (or Churches) a voice in the admission of members; but it thus appears that their plan would not make other circuits a whit more independent than Louth was, until, to use Mr. Larder's expressive words, "they felt they had got something upon their necks."

This question of the authority of Leaders' Meetings, led to a curious discussion, concerning the difference between England and Ireland, in this respect. In the latter country, the leaders have the privilege claimed for Louth. Mr. Sharpley could not understand, he said, how a custom which was law there, should be forbidden here, and would feel obliged to the President to enlighten him. Mr. Loutit flounced about on the subject of degrading a Superintendent into a mere Secretary; Dr. Beecham pointed out the tendency of all such usages to render the minister a mere chairman; and Mr. Keeling talked about the "right" to announce a candidate ineligible as not taken away, even while constrained to admit that the "opportunity" was, tauntingly exclaiming,—"If you think Dissenters or Episcopalian approach nearer New Testament principles than ourselves, *why, then, join them!*" And in this very ingenious way Mr. Sharpley's single appeal to the dumb-founded President was evaded till after dinner.

Mr. Hurley, however, at the close of a speech dictated by the most admirable sentiments, recurred to the point, and, as if taking for granted Dr. Hannah's ignorance on the subject, put the matter before Dr. Beecham. "And now, before I sit down," he said, "I should like to ask Dr. Beecham a question, one which was asked this morning, but one to which no answer was given. According to the Irish Minutes, no one can be expelled without the concurrence of a Leaders' Meeting. This, it appears, is *sanctioned by the English Conference;* and yet, in *our Minutes* it is more than intimated, that *to allow such a thing, would be sinful.* So that, by the same parties, what is apparently sanctioned in one place, would be considered sinful in another. If this is the case, it appears to me to affect the sincerity of Conference; therefore, I should be glad if Dr. Beecham will reconcile this apparent inconsistency." The floundering into which this home-thrust threw the Deputation, fully accounts for their anxiety to prevent publicity being given to their sapient proceedings.

On the third main point of difference, namely, the trial of leaders as members, the Deputation were not a whit more successful than on the other two. Dr. Beecham

had nothing more pertinent or less impertinent to say, than that, because a convicted felon forfeits all civil rights, therefore a convicted Methodist forfeits all offices! Mr. Keeling tried a more seemly parallel, but with no better fortune. "You Preachers," said Mr. Sharpley, "have a right to be tried by *your* peers; so have we leaders a right to be tried by *our* peers." "If," answered Mr. Keeling, "a Preacher is expelled, he is not allowed to meet in class, as a member, except by special consent of the Conference." "Ergo," replied Mr. Sharpley, "a leader, being *deposed from office*, is not allowed to retain his membership." Mr. Keeling's rejoinder is amusingly naïve: "Allow me to say, we never dwell upon the administration of discipline, but we come into collision!"

This singular conversation refers incidentally to several points which might invite remark, such as Dr. Beecham's *dictum*, that the chairman of a meeting, like a Judge on the Bench, is qualified to decide what is the law; Mr. Keeling's absurd argument, that, because Christian ministers give up secular avocations, they also entitled to superior authority,—an argument as good at least for the Pastor of a Dissenting Church as for a Wesleyan Superintendent; the same gentleman's unhesitating ascription of his brother's death to the Reformers; and the President's refusal to answer the simple question, whether any minister could take away a Leader's class-book without other authority, because Mr. Stephenson was not present. Such follies as these betray the weakness of a falling cause; and we are sure that Mr. Sharpley will not find his exertions to induce the Louth people to resume payments, and adopt his very moderate line of policy, much aided by the indisposition to give way a single hair's breadth which appears in all the conduct of the Deputation.—*Wesleyan Times.*

